

Remarks/Arguments

The Office Action mailed June 8, 2009 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as herein amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EPA 0 614 312 A2 to Lu (hereinafter “Lu”).

Claims 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of de Haan et al. “Memory Integrated noise Reduction IC for Television” IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics, Vol. 43, No. 2, MAY 1996, pp175-181 (hereinafter “de Haan”).

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu in view of applicant’s admitted prior art.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of Lu. Although Lu is directed at the same problem, that is, noise reduction during the video encoding process, Lu achieves such reduction in a substantially different manner that not only doesn’t anticipate the claimed invention, but arguably teaches away from the same.

Lu describes video noise reduction system that tracks image pixels across multiple frames. The image pixels undergo averaging to produce noise reduce pixel values. A motion estimator identifies a motion block and determines an approximate velocity vector using a trimmed square estimation procedure. In rejecting claims 1-4 and 6-7 as lacking novelty, the examiner contends that Lu teaches the features of applicants’ claimed technique, including the step of estimating motion N times for each macroblock to yield N motion decision estimation sets. In support of this proposition, the examiner points to Page 5, lines 13-44 of Lu.

However, applicant respectfully submits that Lu provides no such support for the proposition of generating N motion decision estimation sets, where N is greater than 1, for each macroblock. Indeed, as discussed at Page 4, line 25 of Lu, the motion estimator determines a single motion vector, and thus, would not disclose or suggest estimating the motion for each macroblock N times to yield N separate motion vectors, where N is an

integer greater than one. Accordingly, the invention of claims 1, 6 and 7, and the claims that depend therefrom is thus new and novel with respect to Lu.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, all elements of the claim must be found in a single prior art reference (see, e.g., *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. V. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F. 2d 1565. 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed Cir. 1991)). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail is in contained in the claim (See MPEP 2131). The single prior art reference must disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention functioning in essentially the same manner (see, e.g., *Chanklin Corp. v. Springfield Photo Mount Corp.*, 521 F.2d 609 (1st Cir. 1975).

Given that Lu does not teach all of the features of claims 1, 6 and 7, and therefore cannot anticipate the same. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, claims 5 and 8-10, which depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, are not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Lu, taken singly or in any combination with the teachings of de Haan or applicant's admitted prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Dated: 17 September 2009

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312